



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE N. ARABIAN LAND OF MUṢRI IN EARLY HEBREW TRADITION.

### I. THE HISTORY OF HADAD THE EDMITE.

THE present article would never have been written but for Winckler's researches. I do not wish to repeat what he has so ably stated, but to supply some fresh evidence in favour of his conclusions, derived mainly from the story of the flight of Hadad. In spite of the ingenuity expended by him and by Klostermann on 1 Kings xi. 14 ff., the text is hardly yet in a thoroughly satisfactory state, and I venture to think that Benzinger's acceptance in his recent valuable commentary on Kings, of the results of Winckler's analysis, was premature. (The same remark applies to Burney's recognition of Winckler in Hastings, *D.B.* ii. 865 b.) I therefore turn at once to this difficult narrative. Its historical significance is not inconsiderable; an important episode in the life of Jeroboam has also been brought into connexion with it. Winckler in 1892 (*AT Untersuchungen*, 1 ff.) endeavoured to show that the section referred to (1 Kings xi. 14 ff.) was a mosaic of passages from two sources, one of which described the fortunes of a fugitive Edomitish prince named Hadad, the other those of a Midianite named Adad. Both were stated to have found refuge in מִצְרַיִם "Egypt," and to have married wives from the family of the reigning Pharaoh. Winckler also thought that the detail of the Egyptian marriage (for Hadad and Adad are ultimately the same person) had been transferred to the story of Jeroboam's flight into מִצְרַיִם "Egypt," as this story is represented in the Lucianic

Septuagint of 1 Kings xii (Lagarde). Klostermann, on the other hand, maintained (1887) that the notice of the Egyptian marriage, and what hangs together with this, had been interpolated into the story of Hadad from the story of Jeroboam, and also that the story of the flight of Hadad had received one little interpolation in vers. 17, 18 (from "Now Hadad was a little boy" to "men from Paran"). On a careful study of the text I cannot find that Winckler and Benzinger are right, except as regards the notice of the Egyptian marriage of Jeroboam in Lucian's text of 1 Kings xii, and the only probable interpolation which I can recognize in the text of 1 Kings xi. 14 ff. is וְהָדָד נֶעַר קָטָן "Now Hadad was a little boy(?)." The text appears to me to be in a state resembling that of many passages of the prophets and Psalms; it has suffered both from ordinary corruption and from dittography. I admit that vers. 15, 16 have been expanded by an editor, who thought one or two more details desirable, and inserted them from some source of information no longer extant, but the other supposed traces of a second story of Hadad (Adad) are, I believe, non-existent. For אֲדָד in ver. 17 we should read הָדָד. For אֲדָדִּי "Edomitish" read מִצְרִי "Mizritish" (i. e. belonging to the N. Arabian land of Muşri or Muşur). צ was mistaken for ס as in Isa. i. 13, אֶן for צוֹם (see ט). This correction is of primary importance. "Edomitish" misled Winckler and Benzinger. Another error in the text confirmed them in their mistake. In ver. 17 MT. reads וַיָּקֻמוּ מִמִּדְיָן "and they arose from Midian," or, as ט has it, וַיָּקֻמוּ מֵעִיר מִדְיָן "and men arose from the city of Midian." "Adad," therefore, it is inferred, was a Midianite. But Klostermann has already pointed out that מֵעִיר מִדְיָן is a corruption of מֵעֶבְרֵי אֶבְרִי, and this is a repetition of words which occur in ver. 17. So far this scholar sees rightly. But I greatly doubt whether he is right in reading the context as he does, "Now Hadad was yet a little boy: and men of the household of his father arose and brought him to Paran," &c. I willingly admit that the notice of the age

of Hadad is probably (not quite certainly) an interpolation, but I cannot see that the following words are so. ויקמו is almost, if not quite, certainly a corruption of מצריים. מצ' form a dittogram (to use a convenient term). In ver. 17, לבוא should be ויבא (see ㊤<sup>A</sup>); the scribe's eye passed the intervening words (see ver. 18, ㊤ *kal* εἰσῆλθεν), and wrote 'ויבא too soon. Then he found out his error, and wrote מצריים מעבדי אביו over again in order to continue the narrative correctly. But here another corruption occurs. מצרים has become פארן (just as מצריים in ver. 17 became ארמיים), and then a various reading comes in from the margin to confuse matters further, viz. ויקחו (an alternative to ויקמו), which is followed by אנשים (omitted at the opening of ver. 18), and this by עפם מפארן, which was a necessary insertion in order to make sense of פארן and ויקחו. At last Hadad gets to מצרים; he is not old enough yet to fight, but he is old enough to go. To read ויבאהו for ויבאו in ver. 18 with Klostermann is a great mistake.

And what happens to Hadad in מצרים? Both the texts (that of MT. and that of ㊤) are plainly corrupt. Probably the opening words of ver. 19 should be transferred to ver. 18. Hadad first found favour, and then received sustenance and a wife<sup>1</sup>; ויתחילו at the end of ver. 18 corresponds to ויתחילו in ver. 19. For וארץ נתן לו we should read ואשה נתן לו; when the scribe had written this, he remembered that he had omitted to write וימצא הדד חן וגו'. This omission he repaired, and then resumed, slightly varying the phrase ויתחילו אשה. Between מלך מצרים and ויתחילו נתן לו in MT. comes the strange statement ויתחילו בית ולחם אמר לו. Klostermann has acutely corrected this, referring to 2 Kings xxv. 29. I cannot quite accept his restoration, however; deviating slightly from it, I would read לחם מביתו לחם תמיד ויתחילו "and he (the king) gave him from his (own) house a constant supply of bread." When תמיד had become אמר, it

<sup>1</sup> Winckler has conclusively proved that the story of the Egyptian (?) bride given to Jeroboam is simply taken from the story of Hadad. As I shall try to show presently, Jeroboam probably fled to Muṣri.

was needful to append לו for the sense. In vers. 19, 20 the corruptions are awful. First comes אחות תחפנים הנבירה. Both Winckler and Benzinger retain this, supposing תחפנים to represent a real (Egyptian) name, and הנבירה to mean "the chief wife." Klostermann rightly rejects הנבירה, but his substitute הבכירה (cf. Θ ἡ πρώτη πρεσβυτέρα; Luc. in xii. 36, but in xi. 19 ἡ πρώτη μείζων) is hardly in accordance with Hebrew usage. All three adopt from Θ the strange reading ענות ("or something like it") for the name of Hadad's wife. And all three think that, according to one form of the narrative, Hadad, the "little boy," was given either to the king's wife, or (as Klostermann makes out) to a nurse to bring up in the royal palace. All this is a phantasm, made up of an early scribe's errors and imaginations of modern critics. Treat the passage as if it were in the prophets or the Psalms, and all will become perfectly natural. I quite feel the attraction of Winckler and Klostermann, and would willingly go further and make conjectures on the original forms of the names Anoth and Tahpanes, but I cannot close my eyes to what I believe to be obvious truth.

And what is the nearest approach to truth that, adopting the line proposed, can be made? Inspecting the material with eyes accustomed to the ways of scribes, we see that אחות תחפנים הנבירה (ver. 19) corresponds to אחות תחפנים את (ver. 20). The word-group in ver. 20 is enclosed on one side by ולולו לו, on the other by בנו. Consequently, we expect to find dittography in the enclosed passage. Nor are we disappointed. תחפנ (ים is a corrector's insertion; cf. Tahpanhes) corresponds pretty closely to גנבת, for ג and ח, ב and פ are liable, for phonetic reasons, to be confounded. ת and ה, ר and נ correspond not less closely, גנבת and נבירה being also, as experience shows, confounded, while את might be taken by a scribe as an abbreviated form of אחות. After אשתו in ver. 19 the scribe omitted to write ולולו לו; in ver. 20 he remedied his error. Read ולולו לו את גנבת בנו; גנבת may possibly be connected with the Arabic *ganuba* (*januba*) "peregrinus fuit." "*Genubath*" has certainly no great

authority. For ותגדלו ותגמלו (𐤐 𐤅𐤂𐤁𐤏𐤋𐤁𐤏), as our three critics agree, and תחפנס should be omitted as an explanatory gloss from the margin.

I have still to refer to מצרים and to מלך מצרים. With Dillmann, Buhl, and Marquart I hold that the list of Edomite kings in Gen. xxxvi. 31-39 comes to an end with the king who was subjugated by David (2 Sam. viii. 13 f., 1 Kings xi. 15), and I have myself elsewhere<sup>1</sup> pointed out that Matred and Me-zahab in Gen. xxxvi. 39 are corruptions of Miṣran and Miṣrim respectively. The influence of the N. Arabian land Muṣri or Muṣur on Edom was very strong; thrice this country is referred to in the short list of kings in Gen. xxxvi (viz. in ver. 32, where Dinhabah comes from Rehoboth; ver. 37, where Rehoboth is referred to as "by the river," i. e. the river of Muṣri or the Wady el-'Arîṣ<sup>2</sup>; and ver. 39, where Matred (Miṣrān) and Me-zahab (Miṣrim) both refer to the land of Muṣri). Mehetabel, the queen-consort of Hadad II was of Muṣrite origin. Her son Hadad would naturally flee, not to Egypt, which was then, apparently, not influential in Palestine, but to his mother's relations. The king of Muṣri, in B. C. 720, was called Pir'u, as Winckler with equal audacity and sagacity has pointed out; the earlier view, that the *Pir'u sar (mât) Muṣuri*, mentioned in Sargon's Khorsabad inscription, together with Samsieh the Arabian, and It'amar the Sabaeen, is a king of Egypt (Pharaoh), must be abandoned. I assume that the king of Muṣri in Hadad's time was also called Pir'u, and that just as modern critics have mistaken Pir'u in Sargon's inscription for an Egyptian Pharaoh, so ancient editors mistook the Pir'u of the story of Hadad for a Pharaoh. For פרעה in 1 Kings xi. 18 ff. we should therefore read פראו.

The total effect on the text will appear from the following translation of 1 Kings xi. 14-20. In 1 Kings xi. 14 I of course read והמליכה, with 𐤐; and in ver. 15 בַּהֲיוֹת for בְּהִיּוֹת,

<sup>1</sup> See *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, May 15, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> This second identification is due to Winckler.

with Pesh. and Arab. The former correction is due to Klostermann; the latter to Houbigant.

"And Yahwè stirred up an adversary to Solomon in Hadad the Edomite, who was of the Edomitish royal line. It came to pass, when David overthrew Edom, [when Joab the captain of the host had gone up to bury the slain,] and smote every male in Edom, [he remained there six months—Joab and all Israel—till he had rooted out every male in Edom.] that Hadad, in company with servants of his father who were Mišrites, fled, and came to Mišrim<sup>1</sup>, to Pir'u<sup>2</sup>. And he found favour in the eyes of Pir'u, who gave him food constantly from his (own) house, and gave him as a wife the sister of his (own) wife. And she bore him his son Gunubat, and reared him in the midst of Pir'u's house. And Gunubat was in the house of Pir'u in the midst of Pir'u's sons."

Why this particularity in the narrative, it may be asked? Probably because not only Hadad, but his son Gunubat, did great damage to Israel in following years. But of this no record has come down to us. It is in spite of himself that the narrator mentions some of the heavy drawbacks of the reign of Solomon.

## II. THE HISTORY OF JEROBOAM.

Here again the present article is much indebted to Winckler, who has ably treated the two narratives of the early history of Jeroboam, viz. (a) MT., 1 Kings xi. 26-40, expanded in ver. 40 in accordance with LXX, xi. 43, cf. xii. 2, MT.; and (b) 1 Kings xii. 25-39, in Lagarde's edition of Lucian's text of LXX (1883), or xii. 24, *a-f*, in Swete's *Septuagint* (1887). Winckler's favourable view of the second narrative has been adopted by Benzinger in his very critical commentary on the Books of Kings; Burney however, in his thorough article "Kings," passes it over, doubtless from want of space. It deviates from the view

<sup>1</sup> Now Hadad was a little boy (gloss.).

<sup>2</sup> King of Mišrim (gloss.).

taken by Kuenen (*Onderzoek*, ed. 2, I b, 427, § 26, n. 10), and by Kittel (*History*, E. T., II, 206, § 51, near beginning), but the objections to the narrative in Lucian made by these scholars are not conclusive. I agree with Winckler and Benzinger, except as to the right position of the narrative of the sickness of Jeroboam's son Abijah, and as to the reading of certain important passages in the Hebrew text, which have, as I can show, suffered corruption—corruption which is presupposed, unfortunately, in the Lucianic account of Jeroboam's residence in Egypt. I will consider these passages first.

Jeroboam is called in MT. of 1 Kings xi. 26 "an Ephrathite of the Zeredah, whose mother's name was Zeruah, a widow woman." The common text of LXX, however, says, "an Ephrathite of the Sareira, a son of a widow woman," and Lucian's text, "a man of Mount Ephraim . . . whose mother's name was Sareira, γυνὴ πόρνη." Klostermann is certainly right in correcting "the Zeredah" and "the Sareira" into "Tirzah." Winckler and Benzinger prefer to keep the traditional reading, and think that the reading תִּרְצָח "to Tirzah" in 1 Kings xiv. 17 (where both the LXX texts have Σαρπειρα) is an alteration consequent on the (supposed) transference of the event related to a later period. This is most unwise. Tirzah was evidently an important city (1 Kings xv. 21, 33; xvi. 8, 15, 17, 23); Zeredah (or rather "the Zeredah"?), if such a place existed, was not. Lucian gives Sareira as the name of Jeroboam's mother. This may of course be explained as a mere confusion between צִרְעָה and צִרְיָה. But צִרְעָה, "a leper," is a most improbable name. Lucian's γυνὴ πόρνη can also of course be explained as a designed disparagement of Jeroboam. And "a widow woman" may be regarded as, by the very unimportance of the detail, a proof of the accuracy of the tradition. All this is, I am convinced, a great mistake. The least incorrect text is that of the common LXX text in 1 Kings xi. 26 υἱὸς γυναικὸς χήρας. But only because it gives but one of the three distortions of the true reading, while the two



other texts give two. צרעה, זונה, and אלמנה are all corruptions of מִצְרִיָּה "a Musrite," i. e. a native of the N. Arabian Musri. (We have met with a similar corruption in the Hadad narrative, 1 Kings xi. 17.) And now we can see where Jeroboam found a sure refuge from the vengeance of Solomon—it was in his mother's country—Musri; in the MT. of 1 Kings xi. 40 "Shishak" is an interpolation, and מִצְרִים (thrice) should be read מִצְרַיִם. Now too we can understand why N. Israel as well as S. Israel suffered from the marauding expedition of Shishak, recorded in the temple at Karnak. All this Winckler and Bertholet have missed. On the other hand, they are quite right in holding Lucian's account of Jeroboam's marriage with an Egyptian princess to be a copy of the account of Hadad's Egyptian marriage. Klostermann supposes the reverse of this to be the case. But the two parallel narratives cannot both be historical, and if either of them is historical, it is clearly that of Hadad, for what object was there in making Hadad the Edomite fare as well as Jeroboam the Israelite?

I feel obliged to differ from Winckler and Benzinger again, as to the right position of the narrative of the sickness of Abijah. These critics hold that the passages of 1 Kings xiii (Lucian, ed. Lagarde), in which Jeroboam is referred to as king, and his wife as queen, are interpolations. I can admit that the story, even as Lucian's text gives it, and much more as it appears in MT., has been interpolated, so far as the precise form of the denunciation of Jeroboam is concerned. But it seems to me obvious that the death of Jeroboam's son must have been regarded as a sign of the divine displeasure, and that, whenever the event (supposing it to be historical) took place, narrators would certainly place it after his accession to the throne. I think, therefore, that the position in which the story of Abijah is given in MT. is correct. But I am not at all sure that the story has a historical character. If Abijah was represented as the son of Jeroboam's Egyptian wife (see 1 Kings xiii. 37, Lagarde's Lucian), he must, I am afraid, pass into non-

existence with his royal mother. In conclusion, let me point out how much the case for Neubauer's explanation (*Studia Biblica*, I, 225) of Jeroboam ("the god Amm fights"?) is strengthened by the main result of the above inquiry. Jeroboam was not indeed a Nabataean (נבטאל=נבט "God is splendour"), but he was at any rate a N. Arabian.

### III. SOLOMON'S "EGYPTIAN" MARRIAGE.

In 1 Kings iii. 1 we read that "Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David." In vii. 8 that he "made also a house for Pharaoh's daughter," and in ix. 16 that "Pharaoh king of Egypt had gone up, and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it for a portion unto his daughter, Solomon's wife." We are not however told, in xi. 1-8, anything about the provision which he must have made for the religious wants of the proud daughter of Pharaoh. Did Chemosh the god of Moab really overshadow, in Solomon's estimation, Amen the god of Thebes? And can we venture to suppose with W. Max Müller (*Asien und Europa*, 390) that the king of Egypt had, before "going up" to take Gezer for Solomon, conquered for himself the entire Philistian lowland? Is it not very much more natural to suppose that it is one of the neighbouring kings, not more powerful than himself, who gave him his daughter to wife—scarcely the king of the N. Syrian and Cilician Muṣri, whence (as Winckler shows) Solomon obtained his horses, but the N. Arabian land of the same name? Then we cease to be surprised at the non-mention of an Egyptian deity in 1 Kings xi. 5, 7, and we are led to form the conjecture that v. 7 originally ran either, "Then did Solomon build a *bāmā* on the mountain," &c., or else "... a *bāmā* for the god of Muṣri;" נבטאל לכוּמֹשׁ שָׁקֵן מוֹאב can hardly be right, even if we read אלהי for

שקן<sup>1</sup>. Nor need we suppose that the king of Egypt had already conquered Philistia and reduced Solomon to vassalage. It is much more likely that the king of Muṣri had conquered Philistia, and then proceeded to conquer Gezer for his son-in-law. The statements in 1 Kings iv. 21 [v. 1], viii. 65 (in which מִצְרַיִם "Egypt" should rather be מִצְרִי "Muṣri"), are of course an exaggeration. Nor is it an objection that Jeroboam, as we have seen, took refuge from Solomon in Muṣri. The king of Muṣri may have been glad enough to be able to limit Solomon's centralizing tendency by supporting his antagonist. In conclusion, I may venture to repeat a suggestion which I have made elsewhere, that the mysterious phrase הַר הַמִּשְׁחָה in 2 Kings xxiii. 13 (R.V. marg., "the mount of destruction;" Vulg., "mons offensionis") can hardly be anything but a corruption of הַר הַמִּשְׁחָה "the mount of those who worship" (cf. 2 Sam. xv. 32 אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה שָׁם לֵאלֹהִים).

T. K. CHEYNE.

<sup>1</sup> See Benzinger's keen criticism of 1 Kings xi. 1-8, which is only imperfect as far as מִצְרַיִם and מִצְרִי are concerned. Burney's view (Hastings, *Dict. of Bible*, II, 864, note †) is not radical enough.